DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 205 HE 011 283

AUTHOR Thrash, Patricia A.
TITLE A Sequential Evaluation Model for Institutions with Off-Campus Programs.
INSTITUTION North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE Sep 78
NOTE 52p.; Paper prepared for the COPA/Kellogg Project for the Evaluation of Nontraditional Education; Appendices may not reproduce well

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Case Studies; Educational Alternatives; Educational Change; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *External Degree Programs; Higher Education; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Models; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Central Michigan University; Columbia College MO; *Institutional Evaluation; *Nontraditional Education; Webster College MO

ABSTRACT

Described are the approach of the North Central Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education to the evaluation of institutions with off-campus programs, as well as the experiences of Commission staff members in the development of sequential evaluations for institutions with off-campus programs. Considerations made for nontraditional and rapidly changing programs are discussed. As a result of these evaluation experiences a sequential evaluation model has been produced that may be useful in designing future sequential evaluations. Examples of materials developed for the evaluation of a number of institutions with off-campus programs are presented as appendices. Institutions included are Columbia College (Missouri), Central Michigan University, and Webster College (Missouri). (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171205

A SEQUENTIAL EVALUATION MODEL FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

A paper prepared for the COPA/Kellogg Project for the Evaluation of Nontraditional Education

Patricia A. Thrash
Associate Director
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
Evanston, Illinois

September 29, 1978

HE 011 283

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia A. Thrash

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A SEQUENTIAL EVALUATION MODEL FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS*

This paper indicates the approach of the North Central Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education to the evaluation of institutions with off-campus programs and describes the experiences of Commission staff members in the development of sequential evaluations for institutions with off-campus programs. As a result of these evaluation experiences a sequential evaluation model has been produced which may be useful in designing future sequential evaluations. Examples of materials developed for the evaluation of a number of institutions with off-campus programs are included as appendices to this paper.

---

* The writer acknowledges with appreciation the contributions of a number of people to the development of this paper: Evaluators William Hazard, Barbara Mickey, Donald Roush, Wilson Thiede, Catherine Warrick, and Donald McCarty; President Leigh Gerdine and Vice President Joseph Kelly of Webster College; President Bruce Kelly of Columbia College; Richard Doyle of Central Michigan University; Commission Director Thurston Manning; and Commission Staff Assistant Susan Birnbaum.

I. The Commission's statement on institutions with off-campus programs

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools has in recent years evaluated a number of institutions with off-campus programs. Out of that experience and as a result of a comprehensive survey of off-campus programs offered by postsecondary institutions accredited by the North Central Association, the Commission developed a Statement on Off-Campus Programs which was endorsed by its Executive Board on July 24, 1978. This statement is included as Appendix A.

The statement rejects suggestions made by some that the accrediting associations should impose "tighter controls" and adopt extensive and restrictive additional regulations governing off-campus programs in accredited institutions and confirms the position of the Commission, based on its experience in the evaluation of institutions with off-campus programs, that the policies and procedures already in place in the work of the Commission represent ways in which off-campus programs of poor quality are discouraged without restricting the continued existence and growth of good quality programs. Included in these policies and procedures are the following:

1. The regular examination of off-campus programs as a part of our comprehensive evaluations of all institutions accredited by us. In recent years such examinations have taken our visiting teams throughout the United States, as visits have been made to many off-campus sites.

2. Insistence, through one of our criteria of eligibility, that an institution meet all the legal requirements imposed for offering courses and credits in each state in which it operates.

3. Cooperation among the several regional accrediting associations, so that off-campus sites located outside the home region of an institution are examined by teams including evaluators from several regions. In recent years we have, following this policy, had on North Central teams evaluators from all the other regions.

4. Regarding the establishment of programs of off-campus instruction as an indication of possible substantive change within an institution. Under our substantive change policy, such a change is a signal for a comprehensive examination of the institution, which must be completed, with action approving the change, before the change can be instituted.

5. Requiring more frequent evaluations of institutions experiencing rapid change. Our experience is that many off-campus programs, particularly those conducted far from the home campus, experience many and frequent changes as institutions seek new ways to monitor and guarantee educational quality. In some cases we have provided partial or complete institutional evaluations in successive years for institutions exhibiting such rapidity of change as a result of their off-campus operations.

6. Improvement of regular reporting by institutions to the Commission offices. Our institutional annual reports now ask that institutions conducting off-campus activities outside their home states provide the Commission with a list of all out-of-state sites. Staff monitoring of these reports is a way of our being continually apprised of changes and developments within the institutions.

7. The Commission has recommended to institutions at their request persons to provide consulting assistance in the development and evaluation of off-campus programs. While such consultation is apart from the regular evaluative processes of the Commission, it is a valuable service to our affiliated institutions, and the reports of the Commission-recommended consultants are available to our visiting teams.

II. Commission staff experiences in the development of sequential evaluations

The Commission has demonstrated its ability to develop appropriate procedures for the evaluation of "nontraditional" institutions. These efforts have been reported periodically in the NCA Today and the North Central Association Quarterly, with special attention given to Commission procedures for the evaluation of nontraditional graduate programs, competency-based curricula, external degree programs, and off-campus programs, including military base programs. (1)

As Commission staff coordinated the evaluations of an increasing number of nontraditional institutions we found that, because these institutions were doing new things and were changing rapidly, they required special and intensive scrutiny. A primary concern was to determine whether the nontraditional institution or the institution with nontraditional programs had clear and publicly stated purposes appropriate to a postsecondary institution and the resources to accomplish those purposes. The Commission focused on educational outcomes as well as institutional resources and processes in making this determination.

---

1 H. Victor Baldi, "External Degree Programs: In Search of New Definitions for Quality," North Central Association Quarterly (Vol. 51, No. 2, Fall 1976), pages 275-279.

Patricia A. Thrash, "Nontraditional Institutions and Programs: A Challenge for the Accreditation Process," North Central Association Quarterly (Vol. 49, No. 3, Winter 1975), pages 321-333. (This includes attachments of the FRACHE Interim Statement on Accreditation and Non-Traditional Study and the FRACHE Interim Guidelines on Contractual Relationships with Non-Regionally Accredited Organizations.)

Patricia A. Thrash, "Evaluation of Nontraditional Learning Forms: The Extended Campus Program," North Central Association Quarterly (Vol. 51, No. 3, Fall 1976), pages 280-287.

Patricia A. Thrash, "Perspective: Older Students Find Buyer's Market in Universities," NCA Today (Vol. 21, No. 3, June 1977), page 5.

Patricia A. Thrash, "The Eureka! Factor: An Inquiry Into Educational Alternatives," North Central Association Quarterly (Vol. 52, No. 4, Spring 1978), pages 455-463.

The Commission staff discovered in its initial attempts to develop effective evaluation processes for nontraditional institutions that special efforts were required beyond those ordinarily applied in the traditional or standard evaluation. It was useful to have a clear understanding with the institution concerning the nature, design, and content of the institution's self-study report; the purposes and expected outcomes of the evaluation; and desired evaluator competencies.

We also discovered that the standard on-site evaluation format of a team of persons visiting an institution for a single period of three days was not an adequate format for the evaluation of an institution which offered its programs at a number of geographically dispersed sites, some outside the state of the institution's original jurisdiction. Consequently, we experimented with the development of sequential evaluation designs for a number of institutions.

The standard evaluation design may be characterized as summative; that is, a concentrated effort is made by a team during a single on-site visit for a limited period of time to examine an institution and to develop a report which summarizes the team's perception of the institution at that point in time. The sequential evaluation design may be characterized as formative; it is a format which permits the examination of an institution by the total team and various sub-teams through a series of visits over a period of months for the purpose of validating the institution's development and its responses to earlier team suggestions and, in the case of institutions with off-campus programs, for determining whether those programs are appropriate to the mission of the institution and are programs of quality. Out of this formative interaction between the institution and the evaluation team, through a series of visits over a period of time, a summative determination is ultimately made about the accreditability of the institution.

Sequential evaluation designs were used in the evaluation of a variety of nontraditional institutions: Antioch College, the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities (University Without Walls and Union Graduate School), and Metropolitan State University. In the evaluation of institutions with off-campus programs outside the North Central region--Columbia College (Missouri) and Webster College, for example--sequential evaluation designs were found to be particularly appropriate. Because of the need for comparable information from the sites visited, the Commission staff also found it useful to develop special instruments to assist the team in gathering common data across sites.

In the paragraphs to follow I will offer a personal account of my experience as a Commission staff member in developing a series of sequential evaluations.

A number of evaluators and institutional representatives have assisted in these developmental efforts to formulate an effective sequential evaluation design and instruments for use in the evaluation of institutions with off-campus programs in other accrediting regions. Evaluators William Hazard and Barbara Mickey assisted in the design of the first instrument, which contained procedures for site reviews and a questionnaire to be applied in an evaluation focused on the off-campus sites of Columbia College, Missouri, in Fall 1976. The instrument was used by two-person sub-teams (one NCA member plus one member from another region) to gain consistent information across sites. When the focused evaluation was completed, the two NCA core team members prepared an assessment of the process with suggestions for subsequent evaluations of off-campus programs.

The next experience was with a comprehensive evaluation of Webster College, Missouri, including its extended campus programs in the Southern Association's region, October 1977 - January 1978. Meetings were scheduled in the Evanston office of the Commission and at the institution, so that Webster's President Leigh Gerdine and Vice-President Joseph Kelly and team chairperson Donald Roush could work closely with the Commission staff person in the formulation of a sequential evaluation design that included an initial visit by the total team to Webster's main campus, a series of visits by two-person sub-teams to selected sites in the two accrediting regions where Webster offered programs, and a final visit by the total team to the home campus.

The instrument developed earlier for Columbia College was adapted for the evaluation of Webster's extended campus sites. However, after testing the new instrument, the Basic Site Data Form, at off-campus sites near the home campus during the initial visit, team members and institutional representatives agreed that the instrument should be redesigned so that instead of providing a set of questions to guide the team members in their interviews, it would contain essential information and analysis on common, agreed-upon dimensions prepared by site officials and presented to the team before the site visit. This information was to supplement the materials provided in the institution's self-study report about overall organization, academic offerings, and quality control in its off-campus sites. The task of the team would then be to validate both the information and the analysis provided by the site staff, to seek additional information if it was needed, and to write a report along several critical summary dimensions agreed upon earlier (quality of work offered, relation of program to college degree requirements, general administration and quality control, and comparability of work on campus and at extended campus sites). Team member Catherine Warrick assisted the Commission staff person in a swift revision of the instrument during the initial visit to the home campus.

The revised Basic Site Data Forms were used for the subsequent site visits. Draft reports of the initial visit to the home campus and the visits to off-campus sites were distributed to the team members, President Gerdine, and the Commission office for review before the final visit to the home campus. Both institutional representatives and team members agreed that the revised instrument was much more effective: (1) it provided a modified self-study and assessment experience for the site personnel; and (2) it freed team members from data-gathering of a detailed, informational nature, allowing them more time to validate the information and assessments provided by site personnel and to make judgments about the overall quality of the programs at the site.

Therefore, for the comprehensive evaluation of Columbia College, Missouri, including its extended campus sites, in Spring 1978, the Commission staff worked with President Bruce Kelly and team chairperson Wilson Thiede in the development of a sequential evaluation design and instruments which would incorporate all that had been learned earlier. Because of the effectiveness of that process, President Bruce Kelly has agreed to the publication of the materials developed for that evaluation--the Institutional Summary Sheet and Evaluation Schedule, the Evaluation Design for Columbia College (Missouri), Procedures for the Evaluation of Extended Studies Division Sites of Columbia College (Missouri), and the Basic Site Data Forms--as appendices to this report. (Appendices B-E)

Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant, Michigan, is currently adapting the sequential evaluation model for its evaluation scheduled during 1978-79. Central Michigan University representatives have also formulated a series of questions to assist evaluators in their validation of the information provided in the Basic Site Data Forms. These questions are included as Appendix F.

III. A sequential evaluation model

Out of these and other experiences with sequential evaluations, the Commission staff has developed a sequential evaluation model which may be useful in the design of sequential evaluations for other institutions. The purpose of this section of the report is to provide a brief description of a sequential evaluation model, including instruments developed for the evaluation of institutions with off-campus programs, and to summarize steps in the development and implementation of the evaluation design.

Description. A sequential evaluation model is a format designed to provide an effective formative evaluation of an institution with off-campus programs in terms of its purposes, processes, resources, and outcomes on the central campus and, through the application of instruments designed to validate pre-selected common elements at the off-campus sites, to make a determination concerning the adequacy and quality of these sites which are included in the institution's accreditation.

Steps in the application of the model to the development and implementation of the evaluation design. The steps in the development and implementation of the model can be divided into three stages: preparations for the sequential evaluation visit, conduct of the evaluation visit, and the preparation of the team report of the evaluation.

A. Preparation for the evaluation visit. Institutional representatives and Commission staff meet to develop a formal agreement regarding the purposes of the evaluation, expected outcomes, desired evaluator competencies, and the evaluation fee. Essential tasks to be completed as a result of this meeting are:

1. Review of the institution's self-study report (to determine its adequacy for the sequential evaluation process).

2. Development of the sequential evaluation design (usually in three phases; the total team meets at the home campus at the beginning and conclusion of the process, while sub-teams visit the off-campus sites during the middle phase of the process).

3. Selection of off-campus sites to be visited (a cross-section of sites, at least two in each accrediting region, which represent both the variety of programs offered and the stages of development of the sites).

4. Development of Basic Site Data Forms to be used in the evaluation of off-campus sites (to provide information on common, agreed-upon dimensions across sites to be validated by sub-teams of the total team during their visits to the off-campus sites).

Although it is not essential to the sequential evaluation process, Commission staff and institutional representatives have found it useful to develop a statement which accurately describes the current status of the institution, including its off-campus programs, with the Commission. To this statement may be attached a list of the off-campus sites (location, programs, approximate number of classes and number of students, dates the program is offered). The statement can then be reproduced on Commission letterhead for distribution both by the Commission and the institution in response to queries about the institution and its off-campus programs. The current statement developed for Webster College is included as Appendix G.

B. The sequential evaluation visit. A typical sequential evaluation visit is scheduled in three phases, with a time frame that permits the development and review of draft reports of each phase of the visit by the team members, institutional representatives, and Commission staff before the final phase of the visit. Sufficient time is also built into the process for the review of the final report and the development of an official institutional response to the report by the institutional representatives.

Phase One: The initial visit to the home campus is made by the total team. The purpose of the initial phase is to provide an orientation to the sequential evaluation process, to evaluate the programs on the main campus, and to test the Basic Site Data Forms at nearby extended-campus sites. At this time the team determines whether revision should be made in the site instrument. The Exit Interview provides an opportunity for team members and institutional representatives to discuss findings, ask questions, and suggest next steps. Following the visit, the team prepares a draft report of Initial Impressions, Tentative Findings, and Suggestions for Remaining Phases of the Visit.

Phase Two: Site visits are made by two-person teams from the total team to selected extended campus sites in each of the accrediting regions in which the College offers its programs. Team members receive the Basic Site Data Forms designed to insure comparability of information before the visits. Following the visits the teams prepare brief reports according to an agreed-upon format. The Basic Site Data Forms serve as attachments to the site reports of the team.

Phase three: The total team reconvenes at the home campus for a final visit to confirm findings and to draft the final report. The team, institutional representatives, and the Commission staff person have received the tentative reports from Phase One and Phase Two in advance of the Phase Three visit. The team's accrediting recommendation is given at the Exit Interview, which is Commission procedure for all institutional evaluations.

C. Preparation of the team report of the evaluation. Following the visit, the team chairperson prepares the draft report of the evaluation. After corrections of errors of fact are made by the institutional representatives, the chairperson prepares the final report of the visit. Because of the unusual nature of the evaluation, the introduction to the report should clearly indicate the purpose and design of the visit. The report usually has three parts: (1) a summative report which presents the team's overall assessment of the institution, including its off-campus programs, a summary of strengths and concerns, and the team's accrediting recommendation with the reasons for the recommendation; (2) the reports of the off-campus site visits, with the Basic Site Data Forms as attachments; and (3) appendices consisting of the materials prepared for the visit: Institutional Summary Sheet (a summary of essential information relating to the visit), Evaluation Design for the Sequential Evaluation and Procedures for the Evaluation of Extended Campus Sites and the Basic Site Data Forms.

A team report prepared in this manner is a useful and comprehensive record of the sequential evaluation visit. It also provides essential information to the Review Committee members of the Commission whose task it is to consider the team report and recommendations, along with the institution's response, and to offer a judgment to the Executive Board of the Commission that the team's recommendation be accepted or revised before the final accrediting action is taken.

IV. Observations on the sequential evaluation process

Out of my experience in the development of sequential evaluation designs for a number of institutions, I have suggested a sequential evaluation model as an effective mechanism for the evaluation of an institution with off-campus programs at geographically-dispersed sites. However, those who consider adapting the sequential evaluation model to their own institutional evaluation should be aware of the special demands that the model places upon both the institution and its accrediting commission.

The development of a sequential evaluation requires serious attention by the institution and the commission to a wide variety of details for the coordination of the visit. Factors which must be considered include: development of agreements about the nature of the visit, the evaluation design, the instruments, and the logisitics of the evaluation; preparation and dissemination of materials related to the visit; selection of a team of experienced evaluators who have skills and competencies appropriate to the institution and who are open to the evaluation of different forms of learning;

communication with other regional executives for the selection of evaluators from those regions to serve as members of the evaluation team; notification to appropriate state agency officials of visits to sites in their states. The time necessitated for these preparations is considerable. The administrative costs of these preparations are substantial, as is the cost of deploying a team to a number of sites for a number of days.

The team chairperson must be willing to make an extensive professional commitment to a lengthy and demanding evaluation process, engaging in the initial planning of the visit with institutional representatives and commission staff, coordinating the team through the various phases of the visit, and developing a comprehensive and exacting report that is useful to both the institution and the commission. Significant commitment is also required of the evaluation team members who must devote six to ten days to on-site visits during the evaluation period, and who must contribute to the development of the site visit reports.

Allowance must be made in the time period of the sequential evaluation visit for adequate review of the team reports of the various site visits, for review of the final team report, and for the preparation of the institution's response to the report. Finally, special efforts are required to make Commissioners who serve on review committees and Executive Board members who make the final accrediting decision aware of the special purpose and unusual nature of a sequential evaluation visit.

Having offered these caveats, I would like to emphasize my personal conviction that the special efforts required are justified. There is a clearer understanding on the part of the institution and the commission of the purposes of accreditation and the outcomes of the evaluation process. Those evaluators who have participated in a sequential visit agree that the process stretches their abilities and brings them new insights into the accountability of evaluators. While the sequential evaluation model is not appropriate for every institution or for every evaluation, all institutions would benefit from an evaluation process in which institutional representatives and commission staff members work together from the outset to determine the purposes, procedures, and desired outcomes of the visit.

Patricia A. Thrash
September 29, 1978

APPENDICES

Appendix A — Statement on Off-Campus Programs

Appendix B — Columbia College Institutional Summary Sheet and Evaluation Schedule

Appendix C — Evaluation Design for Columbia College (Missouri)

Appendix D — Procedures for the Evaluation of Extended Studies Division Sites of Columbia College (Missouri)

Appendix E — Columbia College (Missouri) Basic Site Data Forms

Appendix F — Central Michigan University Questions (to assist evaluators in the validation of the information provided in the Basic Site Data Forms)

Appendix G — Statement on the Accreditation Status of Webster College (with attached list of the extended studies sites at which Webster College currently offers programs)

STATEMENT ON OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

Endorsed by the Executive Board
of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education,
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Recent years have seen an increase in concern about programs offered off-campus by institutions of higher education. Much of this concern has been directed to alleged lack of educational quality in such programs. Such allegations have usually been supported by only isolated examples, but conclusions have been drawn -- or at least implied -- about all programs offered away from the campus environment. Suggestions have been made that the accrediting associations should impose "tighter controls" and adopt extensive and restrictive regulations governing off-campus programs in accredited institutions.

The Commission staff has recently completed a comprehensive survey of off-campus programs offered by postsecondary institutions accredited by the North Central Association. An examination of this survey shows:

1. A large number of students served by off-campus programs are associated with long-established extension and continuing education activities of major universities.

2. Substantial numbers of students in off-campus programs are campus-based students participating in programs operated by their home institutions (such as study abroad programs and similar educational programs directed toward broadening the educational oopportunities of "conventional" students).

3. The bulk of the remaining off-campus programs are conducted on military bases primarily for military personnel.

It is clear that these programs have played -- and in our opinion should continue to play -- an important role in extending and enlarging educational opportunity for many persons.

Off-campus programs are examined in the course of North Central's comprehensive evaluation of institutions for initial or continued accreditation. The results of a number of such examinations show that, in general, the off-campus programs of accredited institutions are of at least acceptable educational quality, and some are of excellent quality.

We know, from our examinations, that some off-campus programs of accredited institutions have failed to provide educational work of the desired quality. But a comprehensive view of all off-campus programs shows that those that are of poor quality are a small minority. When our examinations have discovered such programs, the institutions have uniformly sought to make improvements with the assistance, advice, and

continued evaluation of the Commission. When needed improvements have not been possible the programs have been closed.

In light of these facts, it seems to us short-sighted at best to seek to impose heavily restrictive regulations that would make it difficult to offer off-campus programs. Such regulations would place a burden on all off-campus programs, the many good ones and the few poor ones alike. The cost of such restrictions would be a diminishing of the educational opportunities provided by off-campus programs, because they would make offering such programs unattractive. This would be a heavy cost to society, the development of which needs additional educational opportunities for individuals to improve themselves by learning new skills, increasing specialized knowledge, and -- perhaps most of all -- by raising their levels of general education. It is obvious that individuals, interested in and concerned about their educations, would also lose from unnecessary restrictions on educational opportunity.

We believe that most persons seeking additional education are committed to obtaining the best education available to them. Thus, we think that the best means to diminish the already small number of poor quality programs is to increase the number of good quality programs. The growth of off-campus programs -- which seek to serve persons who for many reasons cannot be served on campuses -- shows that there is a need for such programs. We urge our institutions to recognize this need and to seek to meet it within the scope of their various missions. The need is for programs of high quality provided by institutions of substantial educational resources.

We believe that the policies and procedures already in place in the work of this Commission represent ways in which off-campus programs of poor quality are discouraged without restricting the continued existence and growth of good quality programs. These policies and procedures seem to us consistent with those recently recommended by the executives of the regional accrediting associations. Included in these policies and procedures are the following:

1. The regular examination of off-campus programs as a part of our comprehensive evaluations of all institutions accredited by us. In recent years such examinations have taken our visiting teams throughout the United States, as visits have been made to many off-campus sites.

2. Insistence, through one of our criteria of eligibility, that an institution meet all the legal requirements imposed for offering courses and credits in each state in which it operates.

3. Cooperation among the several regional accrediting associations, so that off-campus sites located outside the home region of an institution are examined by teams including evaluators from several regions. In recent years we have, following this policy, had on North Central teams evaluators from all of the other regions.

4. Regarding the establishment of a program of off-campus education as an indication of possible substantive change within an institution. Under our substantive change policy, such a change is a signal for a comprehensive examination of the institution, which must be completed, with action approving the change, before the change can be instituted.

5. Requiring more frequent evaluations of institutions experiencing rapid change. Our experience is that many off-campus programs, particularly those conducted far from the home campus, experience many and frequent changes as institutions seek new ways to monitor and guarantee educational quality. In some cases we have provided partial or complete institutional evaluations in successive years for institutions exhibiting such rapidity of change as a result of their off-campus operations.

6. Improvement of regular reporting by institutions to the Commission offices. Our institutional annual reports now ask that institutions conducting off-campus activities outside their home states provide the Commission with a list of all out-of-state sites. Staff monitoring of these reports is a way of our being continually apprised of changes and developments within the institutions.

7. The Commission has recommended to institutions at their request persons to provide consulting assistance in the development and evaluation of off-campus programs. While such consultation is apart from the regular evaluative processes of the Commission, it is a valuable service to our affiliated institutions, and the reports of the Commission recommended consultants are available to our visiting teams.

We are skeptical that an elaborate procedure requiring special and lengthy prior approvals for off-campus programs would be effective in reducing programs of poor quality. We are certain that such a procedure would inhibit institutions concerned with high educational quality in expanding or initiating off-campus programs. Experience shows clearly that regulations do not prevent abuses: those determined to abuse find ways to circumvent or ignore regulations. Prevention of abuse in education lies in developing within each institution a concern for quality and an awareness of the continuous attention needed to attain high quality. We believe that our program of self-study, which provides the opportunity and incentive for each institution to evaluate itself, contributes greatly to developing such concern and awareness.

And we believe that our monitoring of institutions provides a reasonable chance that those few cases in which poor quality has been allowed to exist will be discovered and that corrective action will be initiated.

Our activities ar of course confined to institutions that have voluntarily sought affiliation with this Commission. Many documented cases of programs of poor quality have involved unaccredited institutions which no accrediting association can influence. We believe that each of the states should have in place appropriate statutes and regulations providing a basic level of protection to its citizens against educational abuse. We stand ready to assist any state considering the adoption of such statutes and regulations. In a number of states in the North Central region cooperation between the state agencies and our staff has assisted the work of both in protecting the public interest and promoting educational quality. Such cooperation is not only effective, but also is provided at minimum cost to the public.

We urge our institutions to give careful thought to the need and demand for off-campus programs and to seek to maintain high quality in such programs. We encourage all who believe that they know of programs of poor quality to communicate that concern to our staff, who can initiate examination and corrective action if it is warranted. Our concern is for high educational quality, which can best be attained not by prior restraint, but by encouraging institutions of integrity to create and improve programs in an atmosphere of freedom and support.

July 24, 1978

Attachment: Information Needed About Off-Campus Programs
November, 1978

NCA

North Central Association
of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Institutions
of Higher Education

1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/449-7110
800/525-0843

820 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
312/864-0740
800/323-6528

INFORMATION NEEDED ABOUT OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

Supplement to the Commission's Statement on Off-Campus Programs

These questions are designed to provide essential information to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools from institutions offering or considering off-campus programs.

1. What are the purposes to be served by the off-campus programs? How are these program purposes related to the purposes of the institution?

2. What are the dimensions planned for the off-campus program: number of locations, number of students, number of teachers, curricula and courses to be offered at each location?

3. Do the off-campus courses carry credit? Is this credit applicable toward degrees of the institution? Is this credit regarded by the institution as equivalent to and interchangeable with credit earned on campus?

4. What is the procedure for approving courses to be offered off-campus? How does this differ from the procedure used for on-campus courses? Are courses and curricula offered off-campus described in the institution's catalog?

5. If degrees are offered for off-campus curricula:

   What is the procedure for approving the degree curricula? How does this differ from that used on campus? Are the degrees earned through off-campus curricula the same as those awarded for on-campus study?

6. What is the procedure for recruiting and appointing off-campus teachers? How does this differ from that used for on-campus teachers?

7. If on-campus teachers also teach off-campus:

   Is the off-campus teaching regarded as a part of the regular teaching obligation or as an extra load? Is there extra compensation or other encouragement for on-campus teachers to teach off-campus?

8. What procedures are used to monitor the quality of teaching off campus? How do these differ from those used on campus?

9. What procedures are used to monitor the quality of student performance off campus? How do these differ from those used on campus?

-more-

10. What administrative officers are responsible for the off-campus programs? How does the administrative organization of the institution relate these officers to those responsible for on-campus programs?

11. What physical resources are needed for the off-campus programs (classrooms, laboratories and other special purpose rooms, library and other learning resources, computers, etc.)? What arrangements have been made to provide these resources? How does the quality of these resources compare with that on campus? What assurances does the institution have that these resources will be available for as long as they are needed for the off-campus programs?

12. What assurances are available that off-campus students will be able to complete programs in a reasonable time (e.g., have sequences of courses been established; is there reasonable assurance that needed courses will in fact be offered)? What arrangements have been made to allow students to complete an off-campus curriculum if the institution does not continue to offer it?

13. What is the relationship of student tuition and fees off-campus and on-campus?

14. What sources of financial support will be used for the off-campus program? Are there any constraints imposed on the off-campus program for financial reasons (e.g., minimum number of students in class; requirement that the off-campus income must meet or exceed off-campus expenditures)? How do these constraints differ from those imposed on on-campus programs? Is it possible for the off-campus programs to draw financial support away from on-campus programs? If so, what will be the effect on on-campus programs?

15. What catalogs, brochures, flyers, advertisements are planned for the off-campus programs? Do these provide full disclosure of all pertinent information (e.g., tuition, fee, and refund schedules; student financial aid information; course descriptions; times at which courses will be offered; degree and curricular requirements; policy on course cancellation; names and credentials of teachers; names of cognizant administrative officers; names and locations of those from whom additional information can be obtained)?

11/2/78

APPENDIX B Revised 6/7/78

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY SHEET

INSTITUTION: COLUMBIA COLLEGE
Columbia, MO 65201

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Dr. Bruce Kelly, President (314) 449-0531

STATE COORDINATING/ GOVERNING OR OTHER RELATED AGENCY: not applicable

INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY: Private, coeducational institution, accredited at the bachelor's degree level, offering liberal arts, general, and teacher preparatory programs
Enrollment: 1,134 at Columbia campus
1,800 at Extended Studies Division sites

TYPE OF EVALUATION: a comprehensive evaluation of Columbia College, including its Extended Studies Division, for continued accreditation at the bachelor's degree level

EVALUATION FEE: cost + $1,000

NCA STAFF: Dr. Patricia Thrash
(800) 323-6528
(312) 864-0740

EVALUATION PERIOD: Spring 1978

REPORT DUE: within six weeks after evaluation

LENGTH OF VISIT: sequential--see attached evaluation schedule

DATE OF VISIT:

Phase I: April 2-6, 1978

The initial visit to the Columbia, Missouri, Campus by the total team. The team will evaluate the programs on the main campus and will test the Basic Site Data Forms developed for the Extended Studies Division at sites within two hours of the campus:

-the Columbia civilian site
-Fort Leonard Wood, MO, military site
-St. Louis military sites

Phase Two: April, May, 1978

Site visits will be made by two-person teams to selected Extended Studies Division sites in each of the accrediting regions in which Columbia offers its ESD programs: North Central, Southern, Western, Northwest, and Middle States. (See attached evaluation schedule for list of sites to be visited)

Phase Three: June 1-2, 1978

The total team will reconvene at Columbia College, Missouri, for its final visit for the purpose of confirming findings and drafting the final report.

Commission Action: July 22-23, 1978

-see other side for evaluation team members-

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS FROM THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION:

CHAIRPERSON:
Dr. Wilson B. Thiede
Provost for University Outreach
University of Wisconsin System
1642 Van Hise Hall
Madison, WI 53706
608/263-6860
Administration/Continuing Education

Dr. John E. Cantelon
Provost & Academic Vice President
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859
517/774-3931
Administration/Philosophy

Dr. Earl A. Roth
Dean, College of Business
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197
313/487-4141
Administration/Business

Dr. Catherine M. Warrick
Dean of the Center for
Experimental Studies
Metropolitan State College
1006 11th Street
Denver, CO 80204
303/629-3018
Administration/English and
Linguistics/Higher Education

EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS FROM THE OTHER ACCREDITING REGIONS:

NORTHWEST ASSOCIATION
Ms. Susan Burcaw
Director of Continuing Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
208/885-6486
Administration/Educational
Administration

WESTERN ASSOCIATION
Dr. John O'Connell
Dean
Western State University
College of Law of Orange County
1111 N. State College Blvd.
Fullerton, CA 92631
714/738-1000
Government/Politics/Law

MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION
Dr. William L. Crump, Dean
School of Business & Public Management
University of the District of Columbia-
Mount Vernon Campus
1331 H Street
Washington, D. C. 20005
202/727-2235
Business/Management
Please use home address:
4242 East West Highway, Apt. 1115
Chevy Chase, MD 20015
203/656-5123

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION
Dr. Jerry Padgett
Dean, School of Business Administration
Winthrop College
Rock Hill, SC 29733
803/323-2211
Economics

OBSERVER OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS:

Mr. Joe Hardman
College Eligibility Section
Division of Eligibility and Agency Evaluation
Bureau of Higher Education
U. S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C. 20202
202/245-2944

(In addition, Columbia officials may invite a representative of the Missouri Department of Higher Education to participate as an observer of the evaluation process.)

Attachment

EVALUATION SCHEDULE FOR COLUMBIA COLLEGE (MISSOURI)

SPRING 1978

PHASE I: APRIL 2-6, 1978

INITIAL VISIT TO COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, CAMPUS AND NEARBY EXTENDED CAMPUS SITES

Sunday, April 2

+team arrives; orientation session Sunday evening

Monday, April 3

+team meets with president and officers

-evaluation of Columbia, MO, campus
-team meets, evening

Tuesday, April 4

+various team members disperse to extended campus sites

-four to St. Louis
--two to Lambert Field, MO — Roth (CH), Crump
--two to Granite City, IL — Cantelon (CH), Burcaw

-two to Fort Leonard Wood, MO — Warrick (CH), O'Connell
--military program (progress since last visit)

-others to Columbia Civilian Program on Campus (progress since last visit) — Thiede (CH), Padgett

Wednesday, April 5

+team reconvenes at Columbia, MO

-draft reports of site visits
-suggest revisions in site instrument
-prepare summary of findings

Thursday, April 6

+Exit Interview

-Initial Impressions/Tentative Findings, and Suggestions for Remaining Phases of the Visit

+Prepare report on site (or immediately thereafter)

Revised 9/27/78 -more-

PHASE II: APRIL, MAY, 1978--VISITS TO SELECTED EXTENDED CAMPUS SITES

General format will be two-person teams to two-three sites in each geographical region for two-three nights.

(Military programs available April 10-29; Civilian programs available April 10-15, May 8-31)

LOCATION	SITE TEAM	DATE OF VISIT
NORTH CENTRAL SITES		
+Denver, CO, Civilian Program	Roth (CH), Padgett	April 17
+Kansas City National Guard Armory -active duty off-base	Warrick (CH), Thiede	May 9-10
+Kansas City Civilian Program	Warrick (CH), Thiede	May 9-10
NORTHWEST SITES		
+Seattle Civilian Program (revisit)	Cantelon (CH), Burcaw	April 30-May 1
+Fort Lewis, WA (active duty/on-base)	Cantelon (CH), Burcaw	May 2
+Fort Lawton, WA (active duty/on-base) -sub-post of Ft. Lewis	Cantelon (CH), Burcaw	May 1
WESTERN SITES		
+San Francisco-3 military sites -all active duty/on-base 1) Treasure Island; 2) Petaluma; 3) Oakland Army Base	Warrick (CH), O'Connell	April 17-19
MIDDLE STATES SITES		
+Hyattsville, MD (military) -active duty/off-base	Roth (CH), Crump	May 1
+Hancock Field, NY (military) -active duty/on-base	Roth (CH), Crump	May 2
SOUTHERN STATES SITES		
+Miami, FL, Military Base -active duty/off-base	Thiede (CH), Padgett	April 24
+Orlando Naval Training Center, FL -active duty/on-base (large; other institutions there)	Thiede (CH), Padgett	April 25

PHASE III: June 1-2, 1978--FINAL VISIT TO COLUMBIA COLLEGE, MO, CAMPUS

+Total team reconvenes for final visit
- -confirm findings
- -draft final report

+Exit Interview
- -accrediting recommendation

COMMISSION ACTION: JULY 22-23, 1978

Revised 9/27/78

APPENDIX C

North Central Association
of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Institutions
of Higher Education

1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/449-7110
800/525-0840

820 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
312/864-0740
800/323-6528

EVALUATION DESIGN FOR COLUMBIA COLLEGE (MISSOURI)

Spring 1978

The elements of this evaluation design result from a number of discussions between Columbia College officials and Commission staff.

Purpose of the evaluation. This is an evaluation of the total institution, including the Extended Studies Division, for continued accreditation at the bachelor's degree level. Because the evaluation encompasses the total institution in terms of its progress since the time of the last evaluation, the team will be concerned about the following elements:

- -that the institution has a clearly-defined mission which is appropriate to the educational tasks it is performing;
- -that the institution has the resources to carry out the mission which it has defined for itself, including its mission of offering programs at extended campus sites;
- -that the institution has responded to concerns identified by evaluation teams which visited the institution in 1973, 1976, and 1977;
- -that appropriate assessment procedures are in place and that, in the evaluation of the Extended Studies Division programs, these elements are particularly important:
  - --quality of work offered;
  - --relation of program to Columbia College degree requirements;
  - --general administration and quality control;
  - --comparability of work on campus and at extended sites.

Evaluation team competencies. Evaluation team members will be selected from the North Central Association region and the other accrediting regions in which ESD programs are offered - Southern, Western, Northwest, and Middle States. Competencies of team members should include the following:

- -ability to assess undergraduate programs both on campus and at ESD sites and to make comparisons concerning the quality of on campus and off campus programs;
- -knowledge concerning both the traditional liberal arts institution and the emerging institution with extended campus programs;
- -knowledge about governance, fiscal planning, budgeting, decision-making, and competency-assessment (including the validation of experiential learning).

Evaluation fee. The fee for the evaluation visit will be actual costs plus $1,000. Patricia Thrash will invite the various regional officers to suggest evaluators to serve on the team. These evaluators will be paid directly by the North Central Association according to its fee standards for evaluators.

Evaluation visit design. This is a comprehensive evaluation, sequential in nature, of Columbia College, including its Extended Studies Division. The visit is divided into three phases:

Phase One: the initial visit to the Columbia, Missouri, campus by the total team on April 3-7, 1978. The team will evaluate the programs on the main campus and will test the Basic Site Data Forms developed for the Extended Studies Division at sites within two hours of the campus:

-the Columbia civilian site
-Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, military site
-St. Louis military sites

At this time the team will determine whether revision should be made in the site instrument. The Exit Interview will provide an opportunity for the team members and institutional representatives to discuss findings, ask questions, and suggest next steps. Following the visit, the team will prepare a draft report of Initial Impressions, Tentative Findings, and Suggestions for Remaining Phases of the Visit.

Phase Two: April, May, 1978
(Military programs available April 10-29; Civilian programs available April 10-15, May 8-31)

Site visits will be made by two-person teams to selected ESD sites in each of the accrediting regions in which Columbia offers its ESD programs: North Central, Southern, Western, Northwest, and Middle States. Basic Site Data Forms have been designed to insure comparability of information. Team members will receive the Basic Site Data Forms prepared by the sites before the visits. Following the visits the teams will prepare brief reports according to an agreed-upon format. The Basic Site Data Forms will serve as attachments to the site reports.

Sites to be visited will be determined by team chairperson Wilson Thiede and Patricia Thrash, in consultation with President Bruce Kelly. (Avoid 1st and last weeks of minimester)

Phase Three: May or June, 1978

The total team will reconvene at Columbia College, Missouri, for its final visit for the purpose of confirming findings and drafting the final report. The team, institutional representatives, and Patricia Thrash of the Commission staff will have received the tentative reports from Phase One and Phase Two in advance of the Phase Three visit. The team's accrediting recommendation will be given at the Exit Interview. Following the Exit Interview, the chairperson and the team will prepare the draft report. After corrections of errors of fact by the institutional representatives, the team chairperson will prepare the final report of the visit.

Commission action. Commission accrediting action is anticipated at the Summer Meeting of the Commission scheduled for July 22-23, 1978, at the O'Hare Hilton in Chicago.

Participation in the process. In addition to the evaluation team members, Columbia officials will invite a representative of the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Mr. Joe Hardman of the USOE/DEAE Bureau of Higher Education, College Eligibility Section, to participate as observers of the evaluation process.

Materials for the evaluation team. See attached list of materials sent to the evaluation team by the Commission and the institution.

Patricia A. Thrash
Associate Director
(Evanston)

September 27, 1978 (Revised)

Attachment

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
820 Davis Street Evanston, IL 60201 (312) 864-0740 (800) 323-6528

MATERIALS FOR THE COLUMBIA COLLEGE (MISSOURI) EVALUATION TEAM

March 2, 1978

MATERIALS PREPARED FOR THE SPRING 1978 EVALUATION OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE

1. Institutional Summary Sheet with attached Evaluation Schedule (attached to letter)
2. Notes of a Meeting with Columbia College (Missouri) Representatives, January 12, 1978
3. Evaluation Design for Columbia College (Missouri)
4. Procedures for Evaluation of Extended Studies Division Sites of Columbia College (Missouri)
5. Columbia College (Missouri) Basic Site Data Forms

GENERAL MATERIALS PROVIDED BY THE COMMISSION OFFICES

MATERIALS TO CHAIRPERSON ONLY:

1. Team Chairperson's Evaluation of Associate Members
2. Nominations for Consultant-Evaluator Associate Program

MATERIALS TO ENTIRE TEAM:

1. Request for Travel Reimbursement forms (5)
2. Handbook on Accreditation
3. Changes Affecting the Accredited or Candidate Status of an Institution, draft statement of July 1977 (to replace material on substantive change currently on page 38 of the Handbook on Accreditation)
4. Draft Statement on Affiliation of Institutions with the Commission, September 10, 1977
5. Comments and Suggestions for Subsequent NCA Review of Columbia College ESD Programs, paper prepared by William Hazard and Barbara Mickey
6. Comments on NCA Evaluation Procedures for Non-traditional, Geographically-Dispersed College Programs, paper prepared by William Hazard and Barbara Mickey
7. Patricia A. Thrash, "Nontraditional Institutions and Programs: A Challenge for the Accreditation Process," NCA Quarterly, Vol. 49, No. 3, Winter 1975, pages 321-329
8. Patricia A. Thrash, "Evaluation of Nontraditional Learning Forms: The Extended Campus Program," NCA Quarterly, Vol. 51, No. 2, Fall 1976, pages 280-287
9. Terrence J. MacTaggart, "New Consumers in Higher Education: Extended Programs for Military Students," NCA Quarterly, Vol. 51, No. 2, Fall 1976, pages 288-295
10. H. Victor Baldi, "External Degree Programs: In Search of New Definitions for Quality," NCA Quarterly, Vol. 51, No. 2, Fall 1976, pages 275-279

-more-

MATERIALS FROM THE INSTITUTIONS FILE IN THE COMMISSION OFFICES:

1. History Sheet
2. Institutional Annual Report
3. Accreditation Status of Columbia College (Missouri) with attached list of Extended Studies Division Sites
4. Columbia College Extended Studies Weekly Report dated February 25, 1978 (sent as an example of the weekly reports made to the Commission offices)
5. Report of a Visit dated May 2-4, 1973; Institutional Responses dated June 8, June 14, June 29; Recommendation/Action Sheet from Summer Meeting 1973; related Action Letter dated July 30, 1973
6. Report of a Consultant Visit by George Rainsford dated December 9-11, 1974
7. Report of a Consultant Visit by Robert Ray dated October 13-15, 1975
8. Report of a Consultant Visit by George Rainsford dated January 11-13, 1976
9. Report of a Visit dated January 26-28, 1976; Institutional Response dated April 1, 1976; Recommendation/Action Sheet from Annual Meeting 1976; related Action Letter dated April 9, 1976
10. Report of an Evaluation Focused on the Extended Studies Division dated July, 1976-February, 1977; Supplement to Report from William Hazard dated April 9, 1977; Institutional Response dated April 1, 1977; related Action Letter dated April 18, 1977 with attached Report of Review Committee from Annual Meeting 1977

MATERIALS PREPARED BY COLUMBIA COLLEGE FOR THE EVALUATION
(mailed from the Commission offices at the request of the institution)

1. Self-Study Report/Abstract
2. Basic Institutional Data Forms
3. Institutional Catalog
4. Extended Studies Division Degree Completion Bulletin, Columbia College, 1977-78
5. Faculty and Student Handbooks

3/2/78

APPENDIX D

North Central Association
of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Institutions
of Higher Education

1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/449-7110
800/525-0840

820 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
312/864-0740
800/323-6528

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF EXTENDED STUDIES DIVISION SITES OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE (MISSOURI)

These procedures are designed so that the information about the sites to be visited is supplied by Columbia College for the site team in advance of the visit. Instead of using an instrument at the site, the team will validate the information provided by the institution in the Basic Site Data Forms and will prepare a report covering specified areas. The use of a standard format for the site team report, with the Basic Site Data Forms as an attachment, will provide comparable data for the sites visited.

Revised September 27, 1978

Evaluation of Extended Studies Division site programs of Columbia College

These elements are important in evaluation of the extended site programs:

1. quality of work offered
2. relation of program to Columbia College degree requirements
3. general administration and quality control
4. comparability of work on campus and at extended campus sites.

Columbia officials are asked to supply information on the Basic Site Data Forms (attached). These forms are designed to give the institution an opportunity to provide basic data and program assessment for the team in advance of the site visit. Assessment of the information provided is essential, as are plans for responding to concerns identified. Here are examples of evidence which might be offered under each of the headings indicated:

1. quality of work offered:

   +syllabi
   +tests
   +grade distribution
   +faculty evaluation by students
   +student projects, reports

2. relation of program to Columbia College degree requirements:

   +final transcripts (samples) (home site)
   +summary of GPA's on graduates
   +transfer credit and experiential learning credit given (range and per cent; mean)

3. general administration and quality control:

   +profile of students admitted/graduated (single term)
   +profile of faculty
   +student products
   +facilities/learning resources
   +per cent of students admitted who leave program or are dismissed; per cent who complete program; samples of good and poor student products (papers, tests, etc.).

4. evidence that the program as it operates at the site provides an adequate education and is comparable to the program offered on the Columbia campus.

   This is the "bottom line" assessment to be offered by the institution and to be validated by the site team.

Responsibilities of the on-site evaluation team

The charge to the evaluation team visiting the Extended Studies Division of Columbia College is to evaluate the quality of work offered, to determine the relation of the program to Columbia College degree requirements, to assess general administration and quality control procedures, and to judge whether the program as it operates at the site is adequate and is comparable to the programs offered on the Columbia campus.

The evaluation team has three basic tasks. The first is to verify the data and to validate the assessment provided by site personnel on the Basic Site Data Forms through meetings with the site program coordinator, faculty members, and students. The second task is to collect independent data on the elements previously cited (quality of work offered, relation of program to Columbia College degree requirements, general administration and quality control, and adequacy/comparability of the program). The third task is to evaluate the information and to write a report of the on-site visit in brief narrative form, using the following format:

1. introduction: brief description of site visited and procedures followed

2. quality of work offered (validation and assessment of course, student, faculty data)

3. relation of program to Columbia College degree requirements (validation and assessment of course, student, and faculty data)

4. general administration and quality control (validation and assessment of data from site program coordinator, faculty)

5. statement of the team's judgment whether the program as it operates at the site provides an adequate education and is comparable to the program offered on the Columbia campus

6. attachment of the Basic Site Data Forms as an appendix to the report

The cover sheet of the report should read as follows:

Report of a Visit to

(name, location of site)

An Extended Studies Division Site of Columbia College (Missouri)

on

(dates of visit)

by

A North Central Association Evaluation Team

(list chairperson and team member(s)--
name, title, institution)

Institutional materials for the evaluation visit

1. these materials which team members will receive should be reviewed before the initial visit to Columbia College (Phase One)

   +Columbia College Self-Study Report/Abstract
   +Basic Institutional Data Forms
   +Institutional Catalogs
   +Faculty and Student Handbooks

2. these materials should be available to the appropriate team members either during the Phase I visit or well in advance of the visit to the site:

   +Basic Site Data Forms
   +course descriptions, course outlines, and competencies for courses available on the evening of the site visit

3. these materials should be available on site:

   +all faculty files (including vitae)
   +sample transcripts for graduates of the last year or two
   +sample tests, quizzes, etc. used by faculty
   +sample "work products" of students

Procedures for the visit

1. The site team chairperson should make final arrangements for the team visit with President Bruce Kelly. Dr. Kelly or his designate will coordinate arrangements with the chairperson and team member(s).

2. Team members should plan to arrive at the site by noon of the day when evening classes are to be visited. Departure plans can be made for late morning or noon of the day following the visit.

3. The site team chairperson should forward copies of the report of the site visit to (1) President Kelly, (2) Dr. Thiede, and (3) Dr. Thrash for review. Correction of errors of fact should be sent to the site team chairperson and to Dr. Thiede, who has the responsibility for correcting errors of fact for the final total team report.

4. Columbia College officials and all members of the team who made the initial visit to the Columbia campus on April 3-7, 1978, are to receive copies of the Initial Team Report and copies of the reports of each site visit in advance of the final team meeting on the Columbia campus.

Revised 9/27/78

NCA

North Central Association
of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Institutions
of Higher Education

1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/449-7110
800/525-0840

820 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
312/864-0740
800/323-6528

COLUMBIA COLLEGE (MISSOURI)

BASIC SITE DATA FORMS

THE FORMS ATTACHED ARE DESIGNED TO GIVE THE INSTITUTION AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE BASIC DATA AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FOR THE TEAM IN ADVANCE OF THE SITE VISIT.

THE DATA FORMS ARE ORGANIZED AS FOLLOWS:

PART ONE: COURSE DATA

PART TWO: DATA FROM THE SITE PROGRAM COORDINATOR

PART THREE: DATA FROM FACULTY MEMBERS (THIS SHEET SHOULD BE REPRODUCED SO THAT EACH FACULTY MEMBER FILLS OUT A SHEET)

PART FOUR: STUDENT DATA

BASIC SITE DATA

A. Site location (indicate name, address, military or civilian site):

B. Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the following persons:

1. Site coordinator:

2. Education service officer:

Evaluation team members: Date of visit:

PART ONE: BASIC COURSE DATA

A. Basic course data. Provide the following information for all courses offered this term:*

Course number	Title	Instructor's name	Time course meets	Date course begins	Date course ends	Number enrolled

B. Description of classroom facilities. Provide brief description of location, physical characteristics, adequacy of space, equipment, facilities, library resources, etc.:

39

*As an attachment, please provide a listing of all courses offered at this site by term since the establishment of the program and the total number of students enrolled for each term.

PART TWO: DATA FROM SITE PROGRAM COORDINATOR

A. What are your principal duties?

B. What role or responsibility do you have in:

1. Organizing and scheduling courses on your site?

2. Monitoring, assessing, or evaluating instruction?

3. Advising students?

4. Working with base education officer?

C. Describe the nature and frequency of your communications with Columbia College officials at the home campus, commenting specifically on:

1. Written reports to Extended Studies Division:

2. Training programs for faculty:

3. Other:

D. From your perspective, what are the program's greatest...

1. Strengths?

2. Needs?

E. What are your plans to respond to the needs you have identified?

PART THREE: DATA FROM FACULTY MEMBERS

PLEASE DUPLICATE THIS SHEET AT THE SITE SO THAT EACH INSTRUCTOR TEACHING THIS TERM MAY PROVIDE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED ON BOTH SIDES.

Name:

Academic Field:

1. Prior relevant experience:

2. Prior relevant training and date of training:

3. Evidence of scholarly activity:

4. How do you remain current with the theory and practice in your field?

5. Instructional styles, modes, or methods used in the course:

6. Is the ESD program in the process of developing and implementing competencies for this course? Yes____No____ If yes, describe their utility and adequacy.

7. What kinds of evaluation of student progress are the basis for assigning grades in your classes? (e.g., quiz, test, papers, etc.)

8. Comment on how you feel about the responsibility of screening students in and out of the program by your grading policies?

9. Materials (text, supplemental, etc.) used or available to students?

-over-

10. Describe the nature and frequency of your communications with the site coordinator and Columbia College officials:

11. How do you deal with class absences and missed class work?

12. From your perspective, what quality control procedures are used in the program?

13. Describe the utility of faculty meetings and/or workshops which you attend:

14. Describe ways in which your classroom performance is evaluated. Do these techniques provide, in your judgment, an accurate and helpful appraisal of your performance?

15. From your perspective, what are the program's greatest...

    a. Strengths?

    b. Needs for further development?

16. Additional comments:

PART SIX: STUDENT DATA (five most recent minimesters) (indicate date)

CONTINUING STUDENTS				
NEWLY ADMITTED STUDENTS				
TOTAL ENROLLMENT				
NUMBER OF STUDENTS: IN GOOD STANDING				
ON WARNING				
ON PROBATION				
WITHDRAWN				
SUSPENDED				
NUMBER OF STUDENTS GRADUATED				
GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATES (see attached sheet)				
MEAN NUMBER OF CREDITS TRANSFERRED BY EACH GRADUATE				
MEAN NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION CREDITS TRANSFERRED BY EACH GRADUATE				
MEAN NUMBER OF EXPERIENTIAL CREDITS OF GRADUATES				
MEAN NUMBER OF COLUMBIA CREDITS OF GRADUATES				

APPENDIX F

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS

A series of questions prepared by the institution for the sequential evaluation of Central Michigan University in 1978-79 to assist evaluators in their validation of the information provided in the Basic Site Data Forms.

I. Site location. Adequacy of the location: physical space, equipment, classroom facilities, library resources, etc.

II. Courses. Are the courses offered as indicated?

III. Program Manager. General observations or comments relative to program operations and quality control as well as program manager's familiarity with policies and procedures prescribed by the College.

IV. Center representatives. General observations relative to program operations and quality control and the center representative's familiarity with policies and procedures prescribed by the College.

V. Academic advisers. General observations relative to program operations and quality control and the adviser's familiarity with policies and procedures prescribed by the College.

VI. Faculty members. General observations on the adequacy of the faculty and their familiarity with policies and procedures prescribed by the College.

A. Classroom observations:

1. evidence of instructor's preparation for the class session observed.

2. instructional styles, modes, or methods observed.

3. quality of work offered.

4. instructor/student interaction.

5. books and other materials used by students during class.

VII. Students.

A. Group interview data:

1. Are the required and recommended materials for the course reasonably available to students?

2. What are the principal reasons for students' enrolling in this course?

3. What is student opinion about:

   a. the overall quality of the program offered by the College (strengths, concerns)
   b. the quality of instruction
   c. the quality and availability of academic advisement
   d. the procedures used by the College for end-of-course evaluations
   e. availability of books and other resources for students
   f. procedures for making up missed class sessions
   g. type and level of communications with the College, both on site and with the main campus
   h. responsiveness of the College in resolving any problems students may have encountered
   i. the effect, if any, of the scheduling format sequence on the student's ability to complete the requirements of the course
   j. availability of learning resources (library, etc.)

B. Classroom observations:

1. Student response, participation, and interaction in the class session.

2. Evidence of student preparation for the class session.

3. General observations and comments on the students and the class session(s) observed.

VIII. Records.

A. Are the records consistent and complete?

B. Are they kept in the manner prescribed by the policies and procedures of the college?

C. Are the records secure, and is confidentiality maintained?

D. Are the end-of-course evaluations prescribed by the college used

1. to provide the instructor with an evaluation and an opportunity to improve performance

2. to review and revise courses?

E. Examination of student work products

1. projects

2. reports

9/27/78

NCA

North Central Association
of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Institutions
of Higher Education

1221 University Avenue
Boulder, Colorado 80302
303/449-7110
800/525-0840

820 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201
312/864-0740
800/323-6528

ACCREDITATION STATUS OF WEBSTER COLLEGE

This statement has been prepared by the Commission and the institution as a response to inquiries made of the office of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools regarding the accreditation status of Webster College, St. Louis, Missouri:

Webster College is accredited at the master's degree level. The college offers baccalaureate and master's degrees. Baccalaureate degrees currently offered include the A.B., B.Mus., B.Mus.Ed., B.F.A.; master's degrees include the Master of Arts/Individualized (MA/I), the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), the Master of Music (M.M.), and the Master of Fine Arts (M.F.A.) in Theatre Arts. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Institutions of Higher Education is the regional accrediting commission responsible for postsecondary accreditation in a nineteen-state region, including Missouri, where Webster College is chartered as an institution of higher education.

During the academic year 1977-78, a comprehensive evaluation of Webster College was scheduled to determine the college's readiness to move to a higher degree level. As a part of the comprehensive evaluation, which was sequential in nature, a select and representative sample of Webster's extended sites at which the college offers its master's level programs were included. A list of the extended sites at which Webster College currently offers the Master of Arts degree in Individualized Studies (MA/I) and Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) is attached.

As a result of the evaluation, the Executive Board of the North Central Association's Commission on Institutions of Higher Education took the following action on April 11, 1978:

that accreditation be continued at the master's degree-granting level, with that accreditation to include the extended campus program;

that a comprehensive evaluation be scheduled in ten years, 1987-88.

The action of the Board was based on the materials provided by the institution, the report and recommendation of the visiting team, and the recommendations of the Review Committee.

Additional inquiries may be directed to Dr. Patricia Thrash, Associate Director of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 820 Davis Street, Evanston, Illinois 60201, or to the institution: Dr. Leigh Gerdine, President, Webster College, 470 East Lockwood, St. Louis, Missouri 63119, (314) 968-0500.

Attachment

10/5/78

WEBSTER COLLEGE

470 East Lockwood/St. Louis, Mo. 63119/(314) 968-0500

WEBSTER COLLEGE EXTENDED CAMPUS PROGRAMS

MA/I Sites Within North Central Association

State	Location	Name
Missouri	470 E. Lockwood St. Louis, MO. 63119 James Groetsch, Adm. Assistant 968-0500, Ext. 416	Webster College On Campus
Missouri	326 N. Broadway St. Louis, Mo. 63102 Joseph F. Olszewski, Adm. Assistant 968-0500, Ext. 416	Webster College Downtown Campus
Missouri	Anheuser Busch 721 Pestalozzi St. Louis, MO. 63118 Joseph F. Olszewski, Adm. Assistant 968-0500, Ext. 416	Webster College - Anheuser Busch
Missouri	Jefferson Barracks 25 Sherman St. Louis, MO. 63125 Joseph F. Olszewski, Adm. Assistant 968-0500, Ext. 416	Webster College - Jefferson Barracks
Missouri	TSARCOM Attention: DESTS-RCT 4300 Goodfellow St. Louis, MO. 63120 Joseph F. Olszewski, Adm. Assistant 968-0500, Ext.416	Webster College - TSARCOM
Missouri	RC/PAC 9700 Page Ave. St. Louis, MO. 63132 Joseph F. Olszewski, Adm. Assistant 968-0500, Ext. 416	Webster College - RC/PAC
Missouri	Webster College Base Education Bldg. 104 - Room 102 Richards-Gebaur AFB, MO 64030 Leslie Levin, Coordinator 816-331-8177	Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base

Missouri	Webster College Office Building 499 Ft. Leonard Wood, MO 65473 Ron Stone - Coordinator 314-368-4909	Fort Leonard Wood
Arkansas	Education Services Office P. O. Box 1143 Jacksonville, Ark. 72076 Bert Love - Coordinator 501-988-5331	Little Rock Air Force Base
Colorado	Fitzsimons Army Medical Center Building 620 Denver, Colorado 80240 Mel Stokes, Coordinator 303-341-8977 Autovon No. 943-8977	Fitzsimons Army Medical Center
Colorado	Education Office 46 Aero Space Defense Wing, STOP 45 Peterson AFB, Colorado 80914 Barbara Barrett Holley, - Coordinator 303-574-7562	Peterson Air Force Base
Illinois	Army Education Center Bradley Loop Ft. Sheridan, Ill. 60037 Sandy Ramey - Coordinator 312-432-4940	(1) Great Lakes Naval Hosp. School (2) Fort Sheridan
Illinois	375 ABG-Education Office DPT/STOP 229 Scott AFB, Illinois 62225 Sue Richardson - Coordinator 618-746-4747	Scott Air Force Base
Kansas	Education Office 381 CSG/DPE McConnell AFB, Kansas 67221 Cathryn Carter - Coordinator 316-686-6841	McConnell Air Force Base
New Mexico	1606 Air Base Wing DPT Kirtland AFB, New Mexico 87117 Caroline Hansen - Coordinator 505/255-3645	Kirtland AFB
Oklahoma	Base Education Center/Stop 54 Altus AFB, Okla. 73521 Tamra Paolillo - Coordinator 405-477-0359 Autovon No. 866-6246	Altus Air Force Base

MAT Sites Within North Central Association

Missouri	12411 Wornall Road Kansas City, MO 64145 Marge Tansley, Director 816-942-4050	Webster College
Missouri	Pan Educational Institute 4327½ Troost Ave. Kansas City, Mo. 64110 Joan Williams, Director 816-531-6527	Webster College

MA/I Sites Within Southern Association

Louisiana	Education Office England AFB Alexandria, Louisiana 71301 Linda McKinney - Coordinator 318-448-5618, Ext. 5231	England Air Force Base
North Carolina	Education Services DPT Webster College Pope AFB, North Carolina 28308 Anita Randall - Coord. 919-497-2424 Autovon Nos. 486-4598 or 486-4679	Pope Air Force Base
South Carolina	Education Office 437 ABG/DPT Charleston AFB, S.C. 29404 Mary Ann Miller - Coordinator 803-744-6892	Charleston Naval Station
South Carolina	Education Office 437 ABG/DPT Charleston, AFB, S.C. 29404 Mary Ann Miller - Coordinator 803-744-8488	Charleston Air Force Base
South Carolina	Education Services Office 354 CSG/DPE Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C. 29577 Ann Scoggins - Coordinator 803-238-5831	Myrtle Beach Air Force Base
Texas	Webster College Office Building 129 NAS Corpus Christi, TX 78419 Marsha Reed - Coordinator 512-937-5775	(1) Corpus Christi Naval Air Station (2) Beeville Naval Air Station (3) Kingsville Naval Air Station

Texas	P.O. Box 6037 Ft. Bliss, Texas 79906 June Arnundson - Coordinator 915-568-6426	Fort Bliss
Texas	Base Education Office Building 2248 Ft. Sam Houston, Texas 78234 Grace Howard - Coordinator 512-534-0671 (Brooks AFB) 512-226-3373 (Ft. Sam Houston)	(1) Brooks Air Force Base (2) Fort Sam Houston
Texas	Education Service Office 47th FTW/DPT (in Del Rio, Texas) Laughlin AFB, Texas 78840 Lisa Smith - Coordinator 512-298-3686 Autovon No. 732-2553	Laughlin Air Force Base

MA/I Sites Within Western Association

California	Webster College MCAS (H) Education Office Santa Ana, California 92710 Allen C. Meadors, Coordinator 714/552-0634	Marine Corps Air Station (Helicopter) Santa Ana

OTHER

Iceland	Navy Campus for Achievement Box 15 USNS FPO New York 09571 Patricia Sager - Coordinator Autovon No. 228-0127	Keflavik Naval Station
Switzerland	Dr. John Rider, Coordinator Centre International Reforme John Knox 27 Chemin des Crets de Pregny CH 1218 Grand-Saconnex/Geneva Switzerland Tel: 98-91-71	

Revised as of 6/23/78

MAI SITES

ALTUS AIR FORCE BASE - #15
Tamra Paolillo - Fac. Advsr. & Coordinator
Tal Oden, Faculty Coordinator
Devone Baron, Secretary
Base Education Center/Stop 54
Altus AFB, OK 73521
w: 405/477-0359
h: 405/477-1350
Autovon No. 866-6246

CHARLESTON AFB - #18, & NB - #17
Mary Ann Miller - Coordinator
Dr. Sheila Davis, Fac. Coordinator
Robert M. Knight, Faculty Advisor
Education Office
437 ABG/DPT
Charleston AFB, South Carolina 29404
w: 803/744-8488 (AFB) M,W & F. 8:30 - 4:30
T & Th.12:30 - 4:30
w: 803/744-6892 (NB) T & Th. 9:00 - 12:00

CORPUS CHRISTI NAVAL AIR STATION - #19, #20, #21
Marsha Reed, Coordinator
Dr. Royal Mills, Facutly Coordinator
Dr. Henry A. Santana, Faculty Advisor
Jana Dove, Secretary
Roberta R. Sullivan, Secretary - Beeville
Kate Lawson, Secretary - Kingsville
Webster College Office
Building 129 NAS
Corpus Christi, Texas 78419
w: 512/937-5775
h: 512/991-0668

ENGLAND AIR FORCE BASE - #33
Linda McKinney - Coordinator
Webster College
Education Office
England AFB
Alexandria, Louisiana 71301
w: 318/448-5618 ext. 5231
h: 318/445-4261

FITZSIMONS ARMY MEDICAL CENTER - #31
Mel Stokes - Coordinator
Lawrence G. Seid, Faculty Advisor
Mary Lou Falvey, Secretary
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center
Building 620
Denver, Colorado 80240
w: 303/341-3762
w: 303/341-8977
Autovon No. 943-8977

FT. BLISS - #32
June Amundson - Coordinator
Cynthia Bonilla, Secretary
P. O. Box 6037
Ft. Bliss, Texas 79906
w: 915/568-6426
w: 915/562-4400

FT. LEONARD WOOD - #14
Ron Stone - Coordinator
Charles Taylor - Faculty Coordinator
Newell O. Payne, Faculty Advisor
Building 499
Webster College Office
Ft. Leonard Wood, Missouri 65473
w: 314/368-4909

FT. SAM HOUSTON - #27
Grace Howard - Coordinator
John Yoggerst, Faculty Coordinator
Ellis Harbin, Faculty Advisor
Mary L. Hametner, Secretary - Ft. Sam Housto
Lee Schneberger, Secretary - Brooks AFB
Base Education Office
Building 2248
Ft. Sam Houston, Texas 78234
w: 512/226-3373 (Ft. Sam) 8:00 - 10:00
w: 512/534-0671 (Brooks) 10:30 - 4:00

Ft. Sheridan - #13, #25
Sandy Ramey - Coordinator
Barbara Jeanne Compton, Secretary
Army Education Center
Bradley Loop, Ft. Sheridan, IL 60037
w: 312/432-4940 (direct line)
h: 312/259-8640

KEFLAVIK NAVAL STATION, ICELAND - #36
Patricia Sager - Coordinator
Navy Campus for Achievement
Box 15 USNS
FPO New York 09571
Autovon No. 228-0127

KIRTLAND AFB - #35
Caroline Hansen - Coordinator
1606 Air Base Wing DPT
Kirtland AFB, New Mexico 87117
w: 505/255-3645

JUL 12 1978

MAI SITES (cont'd) Page Two

LAUGHLIN AIR FORCE BASE - #26
Lisa Smith - Coordinator
John Yoggerst, Faculty Coordinator
Ellis Harbin, Faculty Advisor
Education Service Office
47th FTW/DPT
Laughlin AFB, Texas 78840
w: 512/298-3686
Autovon No. 732-2553

LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE - #11
Bert Love - Coordinator
Dr. Rodney D. Neal, Faculty Coordinator
Larry Sullivan, Faculty Advisor
Wilma Love, Secretary
Education Services Office
P. O. Box 1143
Jacksonville, Arkansas 72076
w: 501/988-5331

MCCONNELL AIR FORCE BASE - #30
Cathryn Carter - Coordinator
Dale Richmond, Faculty Coordinator
Mary L. Hooper, Faculty Advisor
Webster College Education Office
381 CSG/DPE
McConnell AFB, Kansas 67221
w: 316/686-6841

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER) - #37
SANTA ANA
Allen C. Meadors, Coordinator
Webster College
MCAS (H)
Education Office
Santa Ana, California 92710
w: 714/552-0634

MYRTLE BEACH AIR FORCE BASE - #28
Lynda Smith - Coordinator
Dr. Sheila Davis - Faculty Coordinator
Elliot Rubin - Faculty Advisor
Education Services Office
354 CSG/DPE
Myrtle Beach AFB, S.C. 29577
w: 803/238-5831

PETERSON AFB - #34
Barbara Barrett Holley - Coordinator
Lee Trovas, Faculty Coordinator
Darwin Mosier, Faculty Advisor
Education Office
46 Aerospace Defense Wing, STOP 45
Peterson AFB, Colorado 80914
w: 303/574-7562

POPE AIR FORCE BASE - #24
Anita Randall - Coordinator
Glen Martin, Faculty Coordinator
Kenneth Kastleman, Faculty Advisor
Trudy Thomas, Secretary
Education Services
DPT Webster College
Pope AFB, N.C. 28308
w: 919/497-2424
Autovon Nos. 486-4598 or 486-4679

SCOTT AIR FORCE BASE - #10
Sue Richardson - Coordinator
Edward Leardi - Faculty Coordinator
Dr. Russ Washburn, Faculty Advisor
Betty Schamberger, Secretary
375 ABG-Education Office
DPT/STOP 229
Scott AFB, IL 62225
w: 618/256-3124 (thru Scott switchboard)
w: 618/746-4747 - direct line

WEBSTER COLLEGE AT KANSAS CITY - #23
Leslie Levin - Coordinator
David Wildman - Faculty Coordinator
Hanalee Waller, Secretary
Plaza Center Bldg, Suite 200
800 W. 47th St.
Kansas City, Mo. 64112
w: 816/331-8177

MAI ST. LOUIS SITES - Faculty Advisors

Dr. Edwin Eilenstine	966-5700 x. 324
Janet Krieger	429-3500 x. 240
Dr. William Lally	524-6228

MARQUETTE BUILDING
Burton Sawyer
Interoffice Mail
Eleanor Deal - Secretary
326 N. Broadway, Lobby
phone ext.: 384

TSARCOM
Hal Rushmeyer
Commander, TSARCOM
ATTN: DESTS-RCT
4300 Goodfellow
St. Louis, Missouri 63120
phone: 263-2157

RC/PAC
Virginia Embrey
9700 Page
St. Louis, Missouri 63132
phone: 268-7797